



**Queensland University of Technology**  
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Mills, Kathy A. & Comber, Barbara](#)  
(2013)

Space, place and power : the spatial turn in literacy research.

In Hall, Kathy, Cremin, Teresa, Comber, Barbara, & Moll, Luis (Eds.) *International Handbook of Research in Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture*.

Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Inc., London, pp. 412-423.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/52706/>

**© Copyright 2012 Kathy Mills and Barbara Comber**

This chapter, in part or in full, cannot be copied for purposes other than for citation and fair dealing under the Australian law.

**Notice:** *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<http://doi.org/10.1002/9781118323342.ch30>

**Cite this article:** [Mills, Kathy A. & Comber, Barbara](#) (2013) Space, place and power: the spatial turn in literacy research. In Hall, Kathy, Cremin, Teresa, Comber, Barbara, & Moll, Luis (Eds.) *International Handbook of Research in Children's Literacy, Learning and Culture* (pp. 412-423) Wiley-Blackwell Publishing Inc., London

## **Space, Place and Power: The Spatial Turn in Literacy Research**

### **Introduction**

Place matters to literacy because the meanings of our language and actions are always materially and socially placed in the world (Scollon and Scollon, 2003). We cannot interpret signs, whether an icon, symbol, gesture, word, or action, without taking into account their associations with other meanings and objects in places. This chapter maps an emergent strand of literacy research that foregrounds place and space as constitutive, rather than a backdrop for the real action. Space and place are seen as relational and dynamic, not as fixed and unchanging. Space and place are socially produced, and hence, can be contested, reimagined, and remade. In bringing space and place into the frame of literacy studies we see a subtle shift – a rebalancing of the semiotic with the materiality of lived, embodied, and situated experience.

A caveat is that space and place are not entirely new to literacy studies. Ethnographies of literacy practices have long emphasized the socio-cultural dimensions of context and situated those practices in particular geographic locales with specific communities (Barton and Hamilton, 1998; Gregory and Williams, 2000; Heath, 1983; Street, 1984). Such work stresses that literacy practices are situated and associated within the different dimensions of life, such as workplaces, homes, or schools (Barton, Hamilton, and Ivanic, 2000). However, spatialized or place-based literacy research draws attention to the material locale as integrally connected to literacy practices, rather than to the socio-cultural context alone. The foregrounding of space and place is steadily increasing in literacy research, as evidenced by the naming of spatial terms in titles and abstracts in literacy research – city, urban, rural, river, ghetto, street, environment, and sites. We acknowledge parallel moves toward the dimensions of time and mobility, as literacy scholars grapple with globalization, and its implications for changing populations, places, and communication (see Compton-Lilly, Chapter 7 this volume).

In this chapter we discuss selected research in literacy studies, which in various ways addresses these themes. We begin by discussing studies that foreground the politics of place and literacy in classrooms and introduce the concept of place-conscious pedagogy through illustrative examples. We then explore place and digital spaces in globalized communication networks

and conclude by considering the potential of new spatial analytical tools for fostering new directions in literacy studies.

### **The Politics of Place and Literacy in Classrooms**

Research that explicitly addresses the spatiality of place, and the associated micro-politics and power relations in classrooms, acknowledges that social and material processes cannot be separated from literacy practices. The critical concerns of race, class, gender, disability, and other categories of marginalization have long been examined, albeit often without a foundation of spatial theorization. For example, four decades ago Rist (1970) researched ability grouping in urban schools, observing how the students' proximity to the teacher and material resources reflected the associated social divisions of race and class. Such work foreshadowed important connections between space, power, and literacy that have been theorized by literacy scholars in more recent times.

Literacy scholars have argued that all literacy practices are ideological (Luke, 1998; Street, 1999) and must be interpreted in relation to larger social contexts and power relations. Applying these principles to the research of literacy practices both within and across communities has yielded significant evidence of patterns of marginalization that are socially and historically constituted. There is now a growing corpus of research that foregrounds the materiality of marginalization in studies of classroom practices (Hawkins, 2004; Janks, 2000; Stein, 2007).

Spatialized literacy research both in and outside classrooms demonstrates that material spaces and places shape the identity and literate practices of youth. The concept of 'third spaces,' as theorized by Gutiérrez, Rymes, and Larson (1995), provides a useful heuristic for explaining the tensions between the teacher scripts and students' counterscripts and identities in classrooms as social spaces. The term 'third space' describes how other spaces might interanimate and create a more heteroglossic authentic interaction – a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation, where official and unofficial, formal and informal spaces become permeable and create the potential for new kinds of learning. Hirst (2004) draws on this concept to theorize power relations in a second language classroom taught by an Indonesian national in an Australian classroom. There were significant power struggles as students challenged the teacher's space. Hirst (2004) demonstrates how a student called Lilly, mimicked a cartoon character to distort the teacher's mode of being to the amusement of the class. There was little space for cultural difference within the typical language lesson 'chronotopes' – that is, ways in which temporal and spatial reality are typically represented and organized in events or texts (Bakhtin, 1981). Students who were neither of the dominant culture, nor shared the ethnicity of the teacher, demonstrated resistance and constructed counterspaces.

A classroom case study by Leander (2002) similarly explored the materiality and situated nature of space, power, and identity in classrooms. Leander analyzed a 'Derogatory Terms Activity' conducted by two teachers in the school, which engaged students in difficult yet open discussions of race, language, and cultural identity. The students recorded examples of derogatory terms that are used to label certain groups, creating a large graffiti banner for the classroom wall. The teacher read the words aloud to the class, and began a discussion to destabilize identities and social spaces, as it challenged the unhealthy social undercurrents that are present in the classroom, often as a type of 'underlife' (Gutiérrez, Rymes, and Larson, 1995). Micropolitical patterns of marginalization were reflected in both the classroom discourse and the physical positioning of the students to one another. In other words, power relations are enacted through inclusions and exclusions in talk and the material positioning of the students' bodies in the classroom. In particular, students labelled a poor African American student called Latanya as 'ghetto,' and Latanya resisted this identity. Leander's spatial analysis brought together

a microgenetic analysis of classroom discourse, an interpretation of the materiality of the seating arrangements, the embodied meanings of the students' gaze and movements, and artifacts in the classroom. The graffiti banner created a highly unstable hybridization of identity stereotypes, making a 'third space' for naming and challenging what is typically unmentionable in an institutional setting (Gutiérrez, Rymes, and Larson, 1995; Soja, 1996). Leander's spatial analysis showed that interactants define and stabilize identity by producing identity artifacts with multimodal means, by constructing configurations of those artifacts, and by using those artifacts to project social space and identity.

Sheehy (1999) coins the term 'in-between spaces' to denote the difficult interactional negotiations that can occur when teachers attempt to shift from reproducing literacies that are disembodied from the materiality of students' lives – worksheets, tests, and typical school knowledge – to focus on the meaningful events, objects, literacy practices, and knowledge inherent in students' own lives. These 'in-between spaces' are akin to Gutiérrez's third spaces of authentic learning interactions. Analyzing a project in a seventh grade classroom that engaged students in understanding the socio-political nature of the planned closure of their school building, Sheehy highlights the tensions that were created in the in-between places. The classroom space was destabilized through the community surveys about the school closure, preparing and presenting public speeches, engaging in difficult classroom dialogues, and meeting with the school board (Sheehy, 2004). Creating this in-between space temporarily transformed textual, time, and spatial relations in the classroom, disrupting the daily rhythms of the typical literacy economy in classrooms.

The spatial dimension of power and marginalization in classrooms has afforded new insights in literacy research, including studies theoretically framed by critical theory (Hirst, 2004; Leander, 2002; Sheehy, 2004). Researchers analyzed the organization and structure of the classroom space as a social product, arising from and contributing to the meaning of purposeful social practices. Social space can refer to both individual and collective social action, which converge at specified times and places (Lefebvre, 1991). It is frequently acknowledged that classroom places and spaces are not separate structures that are independent from the wider social framework (Mills, 2010). A recent study by Dixon in post-Apartheid South Africa (2011, p. 7) makes it clear that 'the geographical location of the schools children attend is not neutral. These locations are shaped and colored by histories of class, race and culture.' Using a Foucauldian approach to the visual gaze and the organization of space within the school as a disciplinary institution, Dixon demonstrates that literacy instruction involves the regulation of bodies in time and place; that meaning-making potential can be seriously curtailed when the authorized curriculum leaves little space for children to learn and focuses instead on the display of outcomes. Moreover, Dixon (2011, p. 168) argues that Foucault's approach to space and time 'opens space for analyzing how particular enactments of literacy may become embodied in particular spaces, but not in others, and why this might happen.'

While the terms 'space' and 'place' are sometimes used metaphorically, such as Sheehy's 'old, new and in-between spaces' (Sheehy, 2004), these terms are often tied to tangible or material contexts of action, which are essentially socially produced (Bourdieu, 1998; Harvey, 1993; Mills, 2010). Whether it be the form, content, and distributional patterns of the built classroom space, or the bodily arrangements and orientations of the students to objects, bringing spatial meanings to the fore acknowledges that places and spaces have a social origin, and are constituted with social meaning (Soja, 1989).

These classroom studies illustrate Said's (1993, p. 7) argument that no one is 'completely free from the struggle over geography.' The distribution of material and social resources, while tied to political, social and economic power, is differentiated by place. The spatiality of justice is an integrative and formative component of justice itself, socially constructed and evolving

over time (Soja, 2010). A critical pedagogy of place can play a vital role in assisting children to understand and respond to the rapid social and geographical changes that influence their social and material conditions for action. Literacy research that ignores place may become abstract, disembodied, and decontextualized from local and global geographies, with their affordances and constraints for meaningful social action.

### **Place-Conscious Pedagogies**

A growing body of research on literacy and place is located within the broader theory of place-conscious education or place-based pedagogies (Gruenewald, 2003a; Theobald, 1997). Theorizing the nexus between critical literacy on one hand, and place as environment on the other, are pedagogies that pursue decolonization and reinhabitation of physical environments. Place-conscious educators engage learners with problems in their material and ecological contexts tied to their local communities. A critical pedagogy of place is more than an environmental movement. It concerns the critical dimension of consciousness in literacy classrooms that positions children as active agents who transform social, material, and ecological places.

In North America, place-based pedagogies have underpinned rural education writing projects for some time (Brooke, 2003; Smith and Sobel, 2010). Indeed at the college composition level the 'rural' has had a particular history in the study of rhetoric (Donehower, Hogg, and Schell, 2007). Donehower and colleagues argue for problematizing spatial terms which tend to elicit certain ways of thinking that either romanticize or demonize the 'rural,' typically in a problematic binary relationship with the 'urban.' While not located in schools, they make a strong case for building citizenship and pedagogy around sustainability, which is broadly applicable across education. Such an approach begins with a critical approach to rural literacies, examining the assumptions underpinning categories for describing and ways of knowing the rural. Assumptions of the rural as empty or culturally underdeveloped tend to pervade educational bureaucracies, and can result in educational success being understood as achieving the credentials to leave a community to go somewhere better – to escape the rural (Corbett, 2007). Such assumptions are dangerous, and left unexamined, may lead to scripted literacy programs being considered as most appropriate for rural teachers and students, whereby students are assumed to have no useful knowledge or experience to bring to school learning (Eppley, 2011).

Critical literacy and environmental communications are contingent upon developing content knowledge of places and geographies. Consistent with this place-based orientation towards understanding the environment is the River Literacies project. This research centered on developing informed understandings of the Murray-Darling Basin in Australia among teachers and students. The participants came to appreciate this distinctive bioregion, and its contributions to the social, economic, and ecological wellbeing of school communities, including indigenous and non-indigenous groups (Comber, Nixon, and Reid, 2007; Green, Cormack, and Reid, 2006). The aim was to facilitate children's re-engagement with the cultural and ecological contexts of communities in the Basin. Teachers also worked with students to explore the affordances of digital technologies in communicating their findings to local and educational communities (Comber, Nixon, and Reid, 2007). Students and teachers researched endangered indigenous local flora and fauna, the ways in which various species were integrally connected and codependent on each other; the politics of decision-making concerning the use and development of spaces (for example constructing a football ground or preserving historic native trees); and the impact of tourism on both the economic and ecological conditions of a river community. Key elements of this work were for teachers and students to build knowledge and understandings of the scientific and social aspects of places. This study demonstrated the important potential of a critical orientation towards the natural environment in an age in which

environmental sustainability is increasingly a global priority.

Also working in the Murray Darling Basin bioregion, Somerville's (2007) analysis of Aboriginal histories, stories, knowledge, symbolic meanings, and places further illuminates the politics of place and literacy. This work applies place pedagogies with Australian indigenous and nonindigenous local communities to create connections between dominant and alternative meanings of water, focusing on the iconic Narran Lakes. The principles underlying Somerville's work are threefold. First, place learning is necessarily embodied and local, demonstrated, for example, in many Australian indigenous legends of how the river began, blended with everyday accounts from indigenous communities who move, live, remember, paint, story, play, and draw from the river.

Second, one's relationship to place is frequently represented through stories and other material artifacts. Somerville illustrates that literacies and places are mutually constituted in place through storytelling and representation, since the earth does not just shape language, but the land itself is also transformed through our representations.

Third, place learning involves contested stories and accounts of spaces. Somerville's (2007) work traced how dominant, Western storylines of place sometimes deny or obscure our bodily connection to earthly phenomena and construct places as 'sites on a map to be economically exploited' (Gruenewald, 2003b, p. 624). For example, dominant accounts of the Murray River reflect a 'cultural and political narrative of technological and agricultural progress' (Sinclair, 2001, p. 24). The stories of the Narran Lake in Somerville's work show that places are often sites of deep contest, such as between the legends of the lake and its creatures, and Western narratives of cultural progress.

It should not be assumed however that place-based pedagogies are concerned only with the natural world, nor are they restricted to schools located in rural and regional communities. All schools are located in places of historical, political, economic, and environmental contestation, and as such, place-based pedagogies are equally relevant and important in urban locales. Negative representations of the places in which schools are located have long plagued state-funded schools in high poverty areas and continue to do so (Comber, Thompson, and Wells, 2001; Gannon, 2009). Comber and colleagues have investigated how literacy practices in classrooms, particularly those characterized by poverty, mediate local social and material action and places (Comber, Nixon, Ashmore, *et al.*, 2006). The project Urban Renewal from the Inside Out provides one example of the ways in which teachers and students can contest deficit discourses about their school communities and engage in literacy practices to bring about local spatial transformation. Teachers, researchers, and students from the fields of architecture, communications, and literacy studies collaborated with elementary students to redesign an area of the school grounds in a poor suburb of Adelaide, South Australia.

The teachers engaged primary students in a series of text-making practices to transform a barren, unshaded space between the school and the pre-school into a student-designed garden. They designed a curriculum based on local and neighborhood literacies and issues of place in the context of a broader municipal program of urban renewal (Comber *et al.*, 2001). The project aimed to equip students with repertoires of powerful social and semiotic practices, such as spatial design, negotiation, and consultation with experts, to achieve material change of their local place (Comber and Nixon, 2008).

The Grove Gardens project enabled the students to work with real designers and architects to transform some of the oppressive elements of their situational reality (Freire, 1970). The architect used workshop methods to introduce key concepts and terms related to social space and architectonic design elements (Comber *et al.*, 2006). Through a process of imagining, negotiating, and representing their ideas multimodally – through oral discussion, written

descriptions, and design concept drawings – a desolate space became a preferred space in the school, both symbolically and materially. Later, a larger proportion of the school was rebuilt – a project that also involved the children in the process of consultation with the local council. Yet the original strip of wasteland that had become ‘Grove Garden’ remained a place of stability within the wider flow of material, social, and ecological urbanization of the school and local area.

An important feature of this spatializing of literacy practices is that critical consciousness is brought about through the authentic unity of reflection and social action (Freire, 1970). The Grove Gardens project foregrounds the critical dimension of consciousness in literacy classrooms, positioning children as active agents who transform social, material, and ecological places. In so doing, teachers and students can leave behind a ‘culture of silence’ and passivity to realize a degree of cultural and spatial freedom (Freire, 1970, pp. 64–65).

Opportunities for such in-depth engagement in a project where students literally redesign and remake their school spaces may be rare, but increasingly literacy researchers are working with culturally diverse school communities to make place the object of study in the literacy classroom. For example Wyse and colleagues (2011) recently reported on a project where they investigated children’s place-related identities using reading and writing tasks. They examined children’s thinking about places they live, their school and neighborhoods, and discourses of place and family.

These place-based pedagogies do not interpret places as stable, homogenous entities, but take into account complex relations between class, gender, race, and extra-local relations of power. Necessary priority is given to how young learners understand the world through their communicative and representational interactions with the immediate environment. This gives logical and developmental priority to the local over against abstract global phenomena. As Gruenewald and Smith (2008, p. xvi) have argued: ‘Place-based education . . . introduces . . . youth to the skills and dispositions needed to regenerate and sustain communities. It achieves this end by drawing on local phenomena as the sources of at least a share of children’s learning experiences.’

These studies of place-based pedagogies all demonstrate that the organization of places is clearly social and ideological (Cresswell, 1996). Places constrain and enable social practices in the interests of maintaining and reproducing established hierarchies. A critical pedagogy of place emphasizes the need for teachers to guide students in the critical analysis of the material conditions of places and the way they are inhabited. Such pedagogies require the critical analysis of the purposes of education and the different places and spaces students inhabit now and in the future. This includes how place and space are reconfigured when literacy practices are mediated by different technologies to communicate with others for different purposes.

### **Place and Digital Spaces in Globalized Communication Networks**

The increasing role of networked technologies in the global communications environment has significant implications for the way in which place and space are experienced, understood, and theorized in literacy research. The New Literacy Studies tradition has demonstrated that web-based literacy practices such as online gaming in virtual worlds (Barab *et al.*, 2005), blogging (Lankshear and Knobel, 2006), micro-blogging (Mills and Chandra, 2011), online chat (Jacobs, 2004; Lewis and Fabos, 2005), journal communities (Guzzetti and Gamboa, 2005), and fan sites (Thomas, 2007) enable cross-cultural, cross-generational, and transnational

connections between people to create new online communities (Lam, 2009).

Online communication practices frequently overlap and yet extend beyond relationships that are forged in a face-to-face materiality. Practices like multiuser online games bring together text users from multiple places to create new social spaces. For example, large-scale ethnographic research by Ito and colleagues has highlighted the way in which collaborative online spaces of youth and adults are tied primarily to friendship-driven or interest-driven social practices that are often situated beyond their local communities (Ito *et al.*, 2009; Ito *et al.*, 2008).

This research is generating useful models for supporting students as globally recognized designers, and critics of digital texts in official and unofficial spaces of learning. Participants have been found to spontaneously transfer certain digital practices from one geographical site to another, such as from school to home, creating media products for intergenerational audiences across diverse social sites (Mercier, Barron, and O’Conner, 2006).

A key example is Moje *et al.*’s (2004) seven-year, ethnographic research of Latino youth in a school and community located in the outskirts of a large city known locally as ‘Mexican Town.’ A focus of Moje’s theoretical work is the tracing of spatial and temporal identities or versions of self that are enacted according to different relations between ones’ material conditions, social contexts, times, and spaces. She illustrates how Latino youth used virtual spaces, such as [city name] raza.com and lowrider.com, to unite the Latino community that was geographically dispersed across the city. Textual practices within these virtual sites fulfilled a vital role in maintaining a sense of pride of their Mexican ethnicity and identities associated with their interest-driven literacy practices.

At the level of literacy research in schools, there are new potentials for exploring the changed materiality of classroom space in digital contexts of literacy practice (Leander, 2003). A growing body of work has examined the intersections between students’ engagement in multimodal design and transformations of classroom space. Classroom studies of digital practices and social space have tended to focus on one or more of the following dimensions of space: bodily, screen, dialogic, embodied, and architectonic (Mills, 2010).

Changed bodily dispositions of students in the literacy classroom have been examined by Bezemer (2008) and Mills (2010) who examined ‘bodily spaces’ – the multimodal displays of bodily orientation, such as specific postures, gaze, and gestures of students. These studies demonstrated that individuals appropriated certain multimodal and gestural resources to be successful learners across the curriculum. Students did not appropriate a limited range of postures that are required when students listen to the teacher. Rather, multimodal designing of films allowed individuals to communicate holistic bodily engagement with displays of bodily orientation in multiple different directions, directly coordinated and differentiated by student groups, rather than the teacher.

Jewitt (2006) and Graham and Bellert (2005) have similarly applied multimodal semiotics to the study of children’s interactions with different ‘screen spaces,’ such as when playing computer games in classrooms. These studies demonstrate that knowledge, pedagogies, and learning are reshaped in significant ways with new meaning potentials when screen spaces are embedded in the English curriculum. Norris (2004) and Mills (2010) have both used multimodal analysis to examine the changed speech interactions or ‘dialogic spaces’ that have been successfully created among students when engaged with screen-based texts. For instance, collaborative multimodal designing of films requires increased horizontal communication between peers, generating new interactional orders among the group. These dialogic spaces differ sig-



nificantly to didactic teaching methods that emphasize vertical relations between teacher and students.

Stanton and colleagues (2001) researched what Mills (2010) calls the changed ‘architectonic spaces’ – material qualities of design and structure, such as spatial arrangements of classroom furniture. For example, Stanton *et al.* (2001) observed transformations of the physical space when students used KidPad, an interface that uses large floor mats and video-tracked and barcoded physical props around the classroom to navigate a collaborative digital story. The new architectonic patterns in these studies constituted markedly different spatial and material arrangements and meanings within the classroom.

In relation to ‘embodied space,’ Stein (2006) and Mills (2010) have examined how students produce identity artifacts, whether as claymation characters in Mills’ research, or as African dolls in Stein’s study. The three-dimensional figures were more than just objects created by children, but were embodiments of internal acts of meaning – playing a symbolic role in the production of social space.

These recent studies point to significant changed material and interactional relations between text users, objects, and the physical classroom space when multimodal designing becomes integrated into literacy curricula. Soja (2004, pp. x–xi) states: ‘When seen as a heterotopia or as fully lived space . . . the classroom becomes an encapsulation of everything and everywhere, a kind of hieroglyphic site that opens up a potentially endless realm of insightful reading and learning.’ These studies extend what has emerged from the transdisciplinary focus on place and space by Soja (2010), Lefebvre (1991), Harvey (1993), Massey (1995, 2005), and other social geographers – that space is not merely a container for social action, but a dimension of social relations that offers significant explanatory power beyond attention to the historical or temporal dimension alone.

### **New Spatial Analysis Tools for Literacy**

With the increasing sophistication in digital technologies for analyzing spatial data, there are expanding potentials for managing both quantitative and qualitative data, and new ways of conceptualizing, measuring, visualizing, and representing spatial relationships. Ferrare and Apple (2010, p. 216) have argued that we need to expand our repertoire of methodological tools to ‘think spatially.’

The spatial turn in anthropological and ethnographic research methods has seen a renewed emphasis on capturing what Pink (2009) describes as the multisensoriality of emplaced experiences, perception, and knowledge in different environments. Pink calls for a rethinking of the ethnographic process through a theory of place and space that has the capacity to bring together the phenomenology of place and the politics of space (Pink, 2007, 2009). Pink’s methodological contributions include new ethnographic approaches – visual and sensory ethnography – that explicitly draw on geographical theories of place, place-making, and space (Massey, 2005), in combination with philosophical and anthropological work on place and perception (Casey, 1996; Ingold, 2007; Pink, 2009). Casey’s writing on place is relevant to sensory ethnographers because he sees places and spaces as events, constituted through lived bodies and material and social objects. Massey’s (2005) ideas invite ethnographers to consider how the specificity and immediacy of lived experiences and its spatial configurations in local places are inevitably interwoven or entangled with wider geographies and spatial contexts.

Visual, sensory, and ‘multimodal ethnography’ share an acknowledgement that sensory data plays an important role in the generation of knowledge (see Kress, 2011). These ethnographic methodologies can incorporate widely used visual methods, such as video, visual artifacts, and hypermedia, to represent the materiality of culture and experience in ways that do not privilege

one form of knowing over another (Pink, 2009).

Similarly, educational theorists of multimodal semiotics have, throughout the past decade, provided a range of analytic tools for examining the materiality of texts and lived experiences in classrooms. For example, Jewitt (2006, 2008), Kress and Bezemer (2008), Kress and van Leeuwen (1996), van Leeuwen and Jewitt (2001), Unsworth (2001), and others have conceptualized multimodal frameworks and categories to describe the features of two- and three-dimensional material spaces. For example, Jewitt (2006) provides a systematic framework for analyzing social action in classrooms, particularly in relation to technology use, that draws on multimodal semiotics (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001), and activity theory (Engeström, 1987). Such theories are specifically oriented towards the materiality of social spaces and places have potentials for exploring new directions in literacy research, in ways that are methodologically and epistemologically compatible with theories of social space.

## Conclusion

This chapter has drawn attention to a growing body of literacy studies that take into account space or place as an important feature in understanding literacy practices. Whether implicitly or explicitly acknowledged as ‘socio-cultural contexts,’ ‘places,’ ‘spaces,’ ‘spatialized literacy research,’ ‘place-based pedagogies,’ ‘literacies of place,’ or ‘socially-produced spaces,’ there is a consensus that place and space matter to literacy practices. While spatial metaphors abound, there is a common recognition that spaces and places are more than simply containers for social action and textual practices. Rather, places and spaces comprise sets of material social relations. Space influences and is influenced by social interactions in the literacy classroom.

Literacy practices and relations between them remain abstractions until they become materialized in some form within places and spaces. Literacy practices and spatiality are mutually constitutive. Foregrounding place and space in literacy studies provides valuable connections between the materiality of literacy and its flows in the new times. What is needed are pedagogies of place and literacy in schools that create new sets of relationships and possibilities in the microcosm of classrooms, by taking into account relevant aspects of spatiality with a view to repositioning students and teachers as agents who can remake inequitable and oppressive social spaces and places in the struggle for better social futures.

## References

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) Forms of time and the chronotype in the novel, trans. C. Emerson. In M. Holquist (ed.) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas, pp. 84–258.
- Barab, S., Thomas, M., Dodge, T., et al. (2005) Making learning fun: Quest Atlantis, a game without guns. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 53(1): 86–107.
- Barton, D., and Hamilton, M. (1998) *Local Literacies: Reading and Writing in One Community*. London: Routledge.
- Barton, D., Hamilton, M., and Ivanic, R. (2000) *Situated Literacies: Reading and Writing in Context*. London: Routledge.
- Bezemer, J. (2008) Displaying orientation in the classroom: Students’ multimodal responses to teacher instructions. *Linguistics and Education*, 19(2): 166–178.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Practical Reason*, trans. R. Johnson. Palo Alta, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brooke, A. (2003) *Twentieth-century Attitudes: Literary Power in Uncertain Times*. Chicago: Ivan R. Dee.
- Casey, E. (1996) How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time. In S. Feld and K. Basso (eds) *Senses of Place*. Santa Fe, NE: School of American Research Press, pp.

13–52

- Comber, B., and Nixon, H. (2008) Spatial literacies: Emergent pedagogies. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 3(2): 221–240.
- Comber, B., Nixon, H., Ashmore, L., *et al.* (2006) Urban renewal from the inside out: Spatial and critical literacies in a low socioeconomic school community. *Mind, Culture and Activity*, 13(3): 228–246.
- Comber, B. Nixon, H., and Reid, J. (eds) (2007) *Literacies in Place: Teaching Environmental Commu-nications*. Newtown, NSW: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Comber, B., Thompson, P., and Wells, M. (2001) Critical literacy finds a place: Writing and social action in a low-income Australian grade 2/3 classroom. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101(4): 451–464.
- Corbett, M. (2007) *Learning to Leave: The Irony of Schooling in a Coastal Community*. Halifax, Canada: Fernwood Books.
- Cresswell, T. (1996) *In Place-Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dixon, K. (2011) *Literacy, Power, and the Schooled Body: Learning in Time and Space*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Donehower, K., Hogg, C., and Schell, E.E. (2007) *Rural Literacies*. Carbondale: South Illinois University Press.
- Engestrom, Y. (1987) Learning by expanding: An activity-theoretical approach to developmental work research, accessed November 21, 2012: <http://lchc.ucsd.edu/mca/Paper/Engestrom/expanding/toc.htm>
- Eppley, K. (2011) Reading mastery as pedagogy of erasure. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 26(11): 1–5.
- Ferrare, J.J., and Apple, M.W. (2010) Spatializing critical education: Progress and cautions. *Critical Studies in Education*, 51(2): 209–221.
- Freire, P. (1970) Cultural action and conscientization. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(3): 452–477.
- Gannon, S. (2009) Rewriting ‘the road to nowhere’: Place pedagogies in Western Sydney. *Urban Education*, 44(5): 608–624.
- Graham, L., and Bellert, A. (2005) Reading comprehension difficulties experienced by students with learning disabilities. *Australian Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 10(2): 71–78.
- Green, B., Cormack, P., and Reid, J. (2006) River literacies: Discursive constructions of place and environment in children’s writing about the Murray-Darling Basin. Paper presented at the ‘Senses of Place’ Conference: April 5–8, Hobart: University of Tasmania.
- Gregory, E., and Williams, A. (2000) *City Literacies: Learning to Read across Generations and Cultures*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gruenewald, D. (2003a) The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. *Educational Researcher*, 32(4): 3–12.
- Gruenewald, D. (2003b) Foundations of place: Multidisciplinary frameworks for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3): 619–654.
- Gruenewald, D.A., and Smith, G.A. (2008) *Place-based education in the global age*. Local Diversity, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gutiérrez, K., Rymes, B., and Larson, J. (1995) Script, counterscript and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown versus Board of Education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3): 445–471.
- Guzzetti, B.J., and Gamboa, M. (2005) Online journaling: The informal writings of two adolescent girls. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 40(2): 168–206.
- Harvey, D. (1993) From space to place and back again: Reflections on the condition of postmodernity.
- Hawkins, M.R. (2004) Researching English language and literacy development in schools.

- Educational In J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, et al. (eds) Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change. London: Routledge. Researcher, 33(3): 14–25.*
- Heath, S.B. (1983) *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms.* New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hirst, E. (2004) Diverse social contexts of a second-language classroom. In K. Leander and M. Sheehy (eds) *Spatializing Literacy Research and Practice.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, pp. 39–66.
- Ingold, T. (2007) *Lines: A Brief History.* London: Routledge.
- Ito, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., et al. (2009) *Hanging Out, Messing Around, Geeking Out: Living and Learning with New Media.* Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ito, M., Horst, H.A., Bittanti, M., et al. (2008) White Paper – Living and learning with new media: Summary of findings from the Digital Youth Project, Chicago, IL.
- Jacobs, G.E. (2004) Complicating contexts: Issues of methodology in researching the language and literacies of instant messaging. *Reading Research Quarterly, 39(4): 394–406.*
- Janks, H. (2000) Domination, access, diversity and design: A synthesis for critical literacy education. *Educational Review, 52(2): 175–186.*
- Jewitt, C. (2006) *Technology, Literacy and Learning: A Multimodal Approach.* Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jewitt, C. (2008) Multimodality and literacy in school classrooms. *Review of Research in Education, 32(1): 241–267.*
- Kress, G. (2011) ‘Partnerships in research’: Multimodality and ethnography. *Qualitative Research, 11(3): 239–260.*
- Kress, G., and Bezemer, J. (2008) Writing in multimodal texts: A social semiotic account of designs for learning. *Written Communication, 25(2): 166–195.*
- Kress, G., and van Leeuwen, T. (1996) *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design.* London: Routledge.
- Kress, G., and van Leeuwen, T. (2001) *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication.* London: Arnold.
- Lam, E.W.S. (2009) Multiliteracies on instant messaging in negotiating local, translocal, and transnational affiliations: A case of an adolescent immigrant. *Reading Research Quarterly, 44(4): 377–397.*
- Lankshear, C., and Knobel, M. (2006) Blogging as participation: The active sociality of a new literacy. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, April 11, San Francisco.
- Leander, K.M. (2002) Locating Latanya: The situated production of identity artifacts in classroom interaction. *Research in the Teaching of English, 37(2): 198–250.*
- Leander, K.M. (2003) Writing travellers’ tales on new literacyspaces. *Reading Research Quarterly, 38(3): 392–397.*
- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space,* trans. D. Nicholson-Smith. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Lewis, C., and Fabos, B. (2005) Instant messaging, literacies, and social identities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 40(4): 470–501.*
- Luke, A. (ed.) (1998) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education,* 2 vols. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Massey, D.B. (1995) *Spatial Divisions of Labor: Social Structures and the Geography of Production,* 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.
- Massey, D.B. (2005) *For Space.* London: Sage.
- Mercier, E., Barron, B., and O’Conner, K. (2006) Images of self and others as computer users: The role of gender and experience. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 22(5): 335–348.*
- Mills, K.A. (2010) Filming in progress: New spaces for multimodal designing. *Linguistics and Education, 21(1): 14–28.*
- Mills, K.A., and Chandra, V. (2011) Microblogging as a literacy practice for educational communities. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 55(1): 35–45.*
- Moje, E.M., McIntosh, K., Kramer, K., et al. (2004) Working toward third space in content area

- literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(1):38–70.
- Norris, S. (2004) *Analysing Multimodal Interaction*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Pink, S. (2007) *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.
- Pink, S. (2009) *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London: Sage.
- Rist, R. (1970) Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(3): 411–451.
- Said, E. (1993) *Culture and Imperialism*. Portugal: Vintage.
- Scollon, R., and Scollon, S.W. (2003) *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World*. London: Routledge.
- Sheehy, M. (1999) Un/making place: A topological analysis of time and space representation in an urban Aooakacguab seventh grade civics project. The Ohio State University, Ohio.
- Sheehy, M. (2004) Between a thick and a thin place. In K. Leander and M. Sheehy (eds) *Spatializing Literacy Research and Practice*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 91–114.
- Sinclair, P. (2001) *The Murray: A River and its People*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Smith, G., and Sobel, D. (2010) *Place- and Community-Based Education in Schools*. Routledge: New York and London.
- Soja, E. (1996) *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Soja, E.W. (1989) *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. Oxford: Verso.
- Soja, E.W. (2004) Preface. In K. Leander and M. Sheehy (eds) *Spatializing Literacy Research and Practice*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. ix–xvi.
- Soja, E.W. (2010) *Seeking Spatial Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Somerville, M.J. (2007) Place Literacies. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 30(2): 149–164.
- Stanton, D., Bayon, V., Neale, H., et al. (2001) Classroom collaboration in the design of tangible interfaces for storytelling. CHI2001, ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI Letters 3(1): 482–489.
- Stein, P. (2006) The Olifantsvlei fresh stories project: Multimodality, creativity, and fixing in the semiotic chain. In C. Jewitt and G. Kress (eds) *Multimodal Literacy*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 123–138.
- Stein, P. (2007) *Multimodal Pedagogies in Diverse Classrooms: Representation, Rights, and Resources*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Street, B. (1984) *Literacy in Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Street, B. (1999) The meaning of literacy. In D. Wagner, R. Venezky, and B. Street (eds) *Literacy: An International Handbook*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 34–40.
- Theobald, P. (1997) *Teaching the Commons: Place, Pride, and the Renewal of Community*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Thomas, A. (2007) Blurring and breaking through the boundaries of narrative, literacy, and identity in adolescent fan fiction. In M. Knobel and C. Lankshear (eds) *A New Literacies Sampler*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 137–166.
- Unsworth, L. (2001) *Teaching Multiliteracies across the Curriculum*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- van Leeuwen, T., and Jewitt, C. (2001) *Handbook of Visual Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wyse, D., Nikolajeva, M., Charlton, E., et al. (2011) Place-related identity, texts, and transcultural meanings. *British Educational Research Journal*, 59(1): 1–21.